REMARKS

Attached hereto are an Excess Claims Fee Letter and fee.

Claims 1-25 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. New claims 10-25 have been added.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Applicants believe the above claim amendments properly address the Examiner's concerns and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Ramjee et al.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2-9 would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent format and to overcome any indefiniteness issues. However, Applicants believe that the present invention defined by independent claim 1, when properly understood, is clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

It is noted that Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

The prior art rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

Applicant's invention, as disclosed and claimed in independent claim 1, is directed to a route updating method for a micromobility network. Routers are connected in a tree connection and radio base stations are connected to the routers in a lowest layer.

An updating notification of a route from a mobile terminal is repeated in order from a radio base station to successive higher order routers to update the route and a packet is

distributed along the updated route. A reaching range of an updating notification from the radio base station toward the higher order routers is set so that the reaching frequency of the updating notification is lower with a higher order router.

The conventional method described beginning at line 14 of page 1 of the specification requires that the routing updates be reflected all the way back to the root node of the tree.

In contrast, the present invention provides a method by which an updated routing is transmitted up the tree configuration only to the level in the tree configuration necessary to reflect the updated routing, thereby reducing the amount of resources needed for processing updating notifications. Moreover, because each layer receiving the update notification packet from the next lower layer will be able to determine whether it should forward the packet to the next higher layer, the method of the present invention is readily scalable.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner alleges that Ramjee anticipates the present invention as defined by claim 1. However, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended solely to attempt to enhance the Examiner's understanding, defines at least one feature that is not present in Ramjee and .

Specifically, the Examiner considers (e.g., at Paragraph 4, on page 3 of the Office Action) that Ramjee teaches: "... wherein a reaching frequency (i.e., reads on HAWAII approach) of an updating notification from the radio base station toward the higher order routers is set so that the reaching frequency of the updating notification is lower with a higher order router (i.e., in HAWAII approach, the updates and refreshes of the second level routers or higher order routers are typically less than the base stations as shown by, $R_{D(\text{2nd level routers})} << B_{D\ (\text{base stations})}$)(pages 290-291, columns 1-2)."

Applicants respectfully submit that, in Ramjee, "R_D (Base stations per DRR)" is the number of base stations per domain root router (DRR) and "B_D (Base station)" is the number of 2nd level routers per DRR, and that these numbers merely reflect the exemplary numbers in the tree configuration discussed in Ramjee. Therefore, Applicants submit that these numbers have nothing to do with a "reaching frequency".

That is, there is no indication in Ramjee that the successively higher layers therein are set to retain the routing information for successively longer periods of time at successively higher order levels in the tree.

In contrast, as exemplarily pointed out by the update notification sequence at line 23 of page 15, this feature of the present invention allows a different updating notification frequency for each layer, even if the mobile terminal is stationary. This feature allows the network resources necessary for updates to be more efficiently utilized.

The example in Ramjee merely demonstrates that only lower levels (up through the "cross-over" router R_0) of the tree configuration need to be notified when a mobile terminal changes base stations. However, this is an entirely different concept than that of the present invention, in which successively higher levels have been preset to have successively longer routing retention periods, thereby accommodating successively lower routing updating "reaching frequencies".

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Ramjee there is no teaching or suggestion of: "...wherein a reaching range of an updating notification from the radio base station toward the higher order routers is set so that the reaching frequency of the updating notification is lower with a higher order router."

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Ramjee fails

to teach or suggest every feature of claim 1 and that, therefore, claim 1 is clearly patentable over this reference.

Moreover, as based on the discussion above, Applicants submit that newly-added claims 10-25 also claim aspects of the present invention that clearly is not taught or suggested by Ramjee or any of the other prior art currently of record.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection currently of record for claim 1.

Further, the other prior art of record has been reviewed, but it too even in combination with Ramjee, fails to teach or suggest the present invention as described by the claims.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/26/04

Frederick E. Cooperrider
Reg. No. 36,769

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
Intellectual Property Law
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254